

Application No. 09/347,390
Reply to Office Action mailed 02/17/2006
Page 7 of 9

Attorney Docket: C-6-5

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the time taken by the Examiner to carefully review the present application. At the time of the Office Action mailed February 17, 2006, Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15-17, 23, 24, 26 and 41-46 were pending in this Application. All claims were rejected. Claims 1, 10 and 15-17 have been amended. Claim 8 has been cancelled. New Independent Claims 47-50 have been added to further define various features of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Double Patenting Rejections:

1. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15-17, 23, 24, 26 and 41-46 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patents 5,873,855; 5,683,366; 5,697,882; 6,032,674 and copending application 09/054,660.
2. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15-17, 23, 24, 26 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,697,281.

Applicants submit a terminal disclaimer herewith to overcome the double patenting rejections to the patents listed above. With respect to copending application 09/054,660, should claims issue from this application that present a basis for a double patenting rejection, Applicants shall file an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer at an appropriate time.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §103:

Claims 1-3, 6, 11 and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,389,096 ("Aita"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,902,289 Swartz ("Swartz"), U.S. Patent No. 5,431,649 ("Mulier") and U.S. Patent No. 5,334,193 ("Nardella"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Aita, Swartz, and Mulier as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent no. 5,125,924 ("Rudko").

Application No. 09/347,390
Reply to Office Action mailed 02/17/2006
Page 8 of 9

Attorney Docket: C-6-5

Applicants submit that Independent Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of Claim 8 (now cancelled). As discussed above, the double patenting rejection to Claim 8 has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Independent Claim 1, and Claims 2-3, 6, 7, 10-11, 15-17, 23, 24, 26 and 41-46 which depend therefrom are now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-11, 15-17, 23, 24, 26 and 41-46

New Claims

Applicants have added new Claims 47-50 to further define features of the present invention. Applicants request consideration and favorable action with respect to new Claims 47-50.


Application No. 09/347,390
Reply to Office Action mailed 02/17/2006
Page 9 of 9

Attorney Docket: C-6-5

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a sincere effort to address all issues raised in the Office Action. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, a telephone call to the undersigned attorney at the number listed below will be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Szymczak
Reg. No. 47,120

ArthroCare Corporation
680 Vaqueros Avenue
Sunnyvale, California 94085-3523
(512) 391-3961

Date: 8/17/2006